



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,031	12/09/2003	Toshiharu Oishi	107156-00216	3017

7590 01/05/2007
AREN'T FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
Suite 600
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER	
HODGES, MATTHEW P	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2879	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/730,031	OISHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matt P. Hodges	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3-7,9-20,22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3-7,9-20,22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) *Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/7/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 3-7, 20, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakano et al. (US 2004/0232813).

Regarding claim 22, Nakano discloses (see figure 7) a flat panel device including a PDP unit and a protective sheet formed on the PDP unit. The protective sheet further includes laminated mutually adjoining and in order from the PDP, an electromagnetic-wave blocking layer (2), an infrared-radiation absorbing and color-tone correcting layer (6 and 7), and a light antireflection layer (9). The layers are bonded to the PDP by means of a transparent adhesive layer (3). (Paragraphs 0343-0348). Further, the EM wave blocking layer would necessarily

provide some heat relaxation to the layers it is supporting by nature of its heat conductivity and composition.

Regarding claim 3, Nakano further discloses the use of an acrylic adhesive layer.

(Paragraph 0312)

Regarding claims 4, 5 and 20, Nakano further discloses the use of adhesives which have an index of refraction of approximately 1.5. This is substantially equal to the glass substrate of the PDP. (Paragraph 0312)

Regarding claims 6 and 23, Nakano discloses adhesives with an adhesive strength less than 3 Kgf/inch. (Paragraph 0316)

Regarding claim 7, Nakano further discloses the filer layer has a thickness of greater than 0.5mm. (Paragraph 0265)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano et al. (US 2004/0232813) in view of Yoshikawa et al. (US 6,255,778).

Regarding claims 16, 18, and 19, Nakano discloses the device as claimed but does not appear to specify the use of a chassis member in contact with the EM wave-blocking layer. However, Yoshikawa, in the same field of endeavor, discloses (see figure 1) a flat panel device

including a PDP unit and a chassis member (7) that interpositions an adhesive member that is optionally made from foam polymer. (Column 6 lines 51-61). The chassis member is included around all edges of the filter and holds the filter against the front of the PDP. (Column 6 lines 21-27). Yoshikawa further discloses the use of a conductive rubber seal material between the chassis and the electromagnetic-wave blocking layer. (Column 6 lines 30-35). The use of a chassis member attached to the PDP advantageously reduces shock while ensuring strong adhesion of the filter layer to the PDP. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate the chassis member in contact with the EM wave-blocking layer as taught by Yoshikawa into the device as disclosed by Nakano in order to advantageously reduce shock while ensuring strong adhesion of the filter layer to the PDP.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano et al. (US 2004/0232813) in view of Wachi et al. (US 2003/0085649 A1).

Regarding claims 9-11, Nakano discloses the device as claimed but does not appear to specify the use of recesses formed in the infrared-radiation absorbing layer and the antireflection film in order to expose a side portion of the EM wave-blocking layer forming an earth connecting part. However, Wachi discloses (see figure 2) a flat panel device including a PDP unit (2) and a protective sheet formed on the PDP unit where the EM-wave blocking layer has an area larger than the other two filter layers. This results in a recess formed in the top two layers above the exposed EM-wave blocking layer. Further the EM-wave blocking layer is grounded at this location. (See figure 2). The recess advantageously provides for a more efficient contact

portion with the EM-wave blocking layer and thus improves device reliability. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate recesses formed in the infrared-radiation absorbing layer and the antireflection film in order to expose a side portion of the EM wave-blocking layer forming an earth connecting part as taught by Wachi into the device as disclosed by Nakano in order to advantageously improve device reliability.

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano et al. (US 2004/0232813) in view of Wachi et al. (US 2003/0085649 A1) and further in view of Yasunori et al. (US 6,417,619).

Regarding claims 12-14, Nakano in view of Wachi discloses the device as claimed (see rejection of claim 9 above) but does not appear to specify the use of a dark coloring on the conductive mesh, however Yasunori, in the same field of endeavor, discloses the use of darkening the conductive mesh of an EM-wave blocking layer for a PDP in order to advantageously improve contrast by reducing flicker or glare. (Column 8 lines 40-45). Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate the black coloring on the conductive mesh as taught by Yasunori into the device as disclosed by Nakano in view of Wachi in order to advantageously improve contrast by reducing flicker or glare.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15 and 17 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 15, the references of the Prior Art of record fails to teach or suggest the combination of the limitations as set forth in claim 15, and specifically comprising the limitation of a flat panel display with a EM-wave blocking filter that extends outwards from other filter layers, is black colored, and includes registration marks.

Regarding claim 17, the references of the Prior Art of record fails to teach or suggest the combination of the limitations as set forth in claim 17, and specifically comprising the limitation of a flat panel display where the flat display panel is mounted on the chassis member with a foam material in between and where the foam material has a Shore hardness of equal or less than 30 degrees.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matt P Hodges whose telephone number is (571) 272-2454. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2879

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mph

NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800



NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800